




**Department of Energy**  
Washington, DC 20585

March 30, 2005

**MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION**

FROM: John D. Evans   
Facility Representative Program Manager  
Office of the Departmental Representative to the  
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DR-1)

SUBJECT: Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators Quarterly Report

Attached is the Facility Representative (FR) Program Performance Indicators Quarterly Report covering the period from October to December 2004. Data for these indicators are gathered by Field elements quarterly per DOE-STD-1063-2000, *Facility Representatives*, and reported to Headquarters program offices for evaluation and feedback in order to improve the FR Program.

As of December 31, 2004, 86% of all FRs were fully qualified, down from 89% the previous quarter, but still exceeding the DOE goal of 80%. Several sites added new FRs or switched FRs from their existing facilities to new facilities, reducing the overall qualification rate. Twenty of 28 reporting sites meet the goal for FR qualifications.

Overall FR staffing is at 92% of the levels needed. Sites have been updating their staffing analyses in accordance with guidance promulgated in two recent memoranda: a September 16, 2004, memorandum from Roy Schepens, Chairman, Federal Technical Capability Panel, and an October 13, 2004, memorandum from Jerald S. Paul, Principal Deputy Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration. The guidance provides an updated methodology for FR staffing that accounts for FR coverage at hazardous non-nuclear facilities and provides an improved workload analysis. The guidance will be included in an upcoming revision to DOE-STD-1063-2000.

Nine reporting sites currently meet all the DOE goals for the performance indicators (i.e., staffing 100%, qualification 80%, FR Time in Field 40%, FR Total Oversight Time 60%). These sites are: Carlsbad, Fernald, Miamisburg, Pacific Northwest, Princeton, River Protection, Rocky Flats, West Valley, and Y-12.

Future FR Program Performance Indicator Quarterly Reports will include a new office, the New Brunswick Laboratory, which recently added an FR to its staff. Current FR information and past quarterly performance indicator reports are accessible at the FR Web Site. Should you have any questions or comments on this report, please contact me at 202-586-3887.

Attachment



Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators Quarterly Report  
March 30, 2005

**Distribution:**

Jeffrey Clay Sell, S-2	Manager, Ames Site Office
Bruce Carnes, S-2	Manager, Argonne Site Office
Les Novitsky, S-2	Manager, Brookhaven Site Office
Linton Brooks, NA-1	Manager, Carlsbad Field Office
Jerry Paul, NA-2	Manager, Fermi Site Office
James McConnell, NA-2	Manager, Idaho Operations Office
Everet Beckner, NA-10	Manager, Livermore Site Office
James Mangeno, NA-3.6	Manager, Los Alamos Site Office
Glenn Podonsky, SP-1	Manager, Nevada Site Office
Mike Kilpatrick, OA-1	Manager, Oak Ridge Operations Office
Patricia Worthington, OA-40	Manager, Office of River Protection
Paul Golan, EM-1	Manager, Ohio Field Office
Mike Weis, EM-3	Manager, Pacific Northwest Site Office
Patty Bubar, EM-3.2	Manager, Pantex Site Office
Raymond Orbach, SC-1	Manager, Portsmouth Paducah Project Office
Milt Johnson, SC-3	Manager, Richland Operations Office
William Magwood, NE-1	Manager, Rocky Flats Project Office
	Manager, Sandia Site Office
	Manager, Savannah River Operations Office
	Manager, Savannah River Site Office (NNSA)
	Manager, Y-12 Site Office

**cc:**

Program Sponsors:

Lloyd Piper, CBFO  
Carson Nealy, CH  
Robert Stallman, ID  
Kirk Keilholtz, LASO  
Steve Lawrence, NSO  
Steve Lasell, LSO  
Larry Kelly, OR  
Doug Shoop, RL  
Chris Bosted, ORP  
Roger Christensen, PNSO  
Karl Waltzer, PXSO  
Ed Westbrook, RFPO  
Charles Hansen, SR  
Connie Soden, SSO  
T.J. Jackson, WVDP  
Dan Hoag, YSO

Steering Committee Members:

Jody Eggleston, NNSA Serv Ctr  
Veronica Martinez, SSO  
Earl Burkholder, PXSO  
Carlos Alvarado, PXSO  
John Scott, FSO

Steering Committee Members,  
continued:

Fred Bell, LASO  
Jody Pugh, LASO  
Joanne Lorence, LASO  
Don Galbraith, CBFO  
George Basabilvazo, CBFO  
Karl Moro, CH  
Leif Dietrich, PSO  
Peter Kelley, BHSO  
Eric Turnquest, ASO  
Joe Drago, NBL  
Mike Haben, NE-ID  
Bob Seal, NE-ID  
Tim Henderson, NSO  
Henry Rio, LSO  
Michael Jordan, OH  
David Cook, WVDP  
Bob Everson, FCP  
Christopher White, MCP  
Tyrone Harris, OR  
Rick Daniels, OR  
Tim Noe, OR  
Jeff Carlson, PNSO

Steering Committee Members,  
continued:

Jeff Parkin, RFPO  
Rob Hastings, RL  
John Trevino, RL  
Larry Hinson, SRS  
John Barnes, SRS  
Phil Giles, SRS  
Steve Wellbaum, YSO  
Jeff Cravens, YSO  
  
Craig Scott, EM  
Emil Morrow, NA  
Ed Tourigny, NE  
Craig West, ME  
Casimiro Izquierdo, FE  
Barry Parks, SC

## ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SITES

### Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators (4QCY2004)

<u>Field or Ops Office</u>	<u>Staffing Analysis</u>	<u>FTE Level</u>	<u>Actual Staffing</u>	<u>% Staffing</u>	<u>Attrition</u>	<u>% Core Qualified</u>	<u>% Fully Qualified</u>	<u>% Field Time *</u>	<u>% Oversight Time **</u>
Carlsbad	1	1	1	100	0	100	100	60	65
Idaho (EM)	8	9	9	100	0.5	100	100	39	76
Oak Ridge (EM)	20	14	14	70	0	93	93	43	63
OH/Fernald	5	5	5	100	0	100	100	47	80
OH/Miamisburg	3	3	3	100	0	100	100	44	67
OH/West Valley	2	2	2	100	0	100	100	51	67
Portsmouth/Paducah	4	4	4	100	0	50	50	34	61
Richland	19	17	17	89	0	100	100	41	67
River Protection	13	13	13	100	0	100	85	60	81
Rocky Flats	4	4	8	200	0	100	100	65	75
Savannah River	30	28	28	93	2	100	100	53	84
<b>EM Totals</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>DOE GOALS</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>&gt;80</b>	<b>&gt;40</b>	<b>&gt;60</b>

\* % Field Time is defined as the number of hours spent in the plant/field divided by the total available work hours in the quarter. The total available work hours is the actual number of hours a Facility Representative works in a calendar quarter, including overtime hours. It does not include leave time (sick, annual, or other) or holidays.

\*\* % Oversight Time includes % Field Time

### EM Facility Representative (FR) Highlights:

- At Idaho (EM), an FR analyzed contractor engineering performance over a five-month period and found evidence of significant breakdowns in engineering design and quality at Facility and Material Disposition Project (FMDP) nuclear facilities that had not been identified in the contractor's quarterly performance analysis reports. Based on the FR analysis, the NE-ID EM Assistant Manager notified the contractor of the negative trend in late November 2004, directing a causal analysis and suitable corrective action plan from the contractor.
- At Oak Ridge (EM), FRs are closely following implementation of the contractor's new work control system.
- At OH/Miamisburg, an FR observed the lack of and improper use of PPE in a designated construction zone. In response to FR concerns, contractor management took immediate corrective actions by re-emphasizing the proper use of PPE and safe work practices thus reducing safety risk to workers.
- At OH/West Valley, both FRs participated on several surveillances during this period to include the following:
  - General Site Maintenance Activities;
  - Sodium-Bearing Waste Project Preparation and Process;
  - Ladder Safety;
  - Waste Management; and
  - Heavy Equipment and Vehicle Safety.
- At Richland, FRs identified the following issues during surveillances:
  - Weaknesses in SNF waste management program and site waste management implementation plan;
  - Validation of subcontractor ISMS implementation self-identified by contractor oversight;
  - SNF project performance failures associated with the sludge retrieval project, basin water clarity, and CONOPS.
  - Inadequate PFP work package detail and procedure content supporting facility D&D.
- At River Protection, an FR identified that the required safe condition check specified on the lockout/tagout authorization form was inadequate for work on a failed valve. The FR determined that an additional safe condition check was necessary to ensure that the upstream portion of the system was depressurized. Immediate action was taken to correct the deficiency prior to starting the work.
- At Savannah River, an FR continued supporting the DOE Integrated Project Team for constructions of a second Glass Waste Storage Building. Deficiencies identified in the areas of job hazard analysis, work planning, and construction safety have helped the small business prime contractor enhance their Integrated Safety Management System. Also all Facility Closure Project FRs recertified as EPA Certified Asbestos Abatement Supervisors.

## NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION SITES

### Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators (4QCY2004)

<u>Site Office</u>	<u>Staffing Analysis</u>	<u>FTE Level</u>	<u>Actual Staffing</u>	<u>% Staffing</u>	<u>Attrition</u>	<u>% Core Qualified</u>	<u>% Fully Qualified</u>	<u>% Field Time *</u>	<u>% Oversight Time **</u>
Livermore	11	9	9	82	0	78	78	48	65
Los Alamos	16	16	14	88	0	93	43	58	76
Nevada	10	8	8	80	0	88	50	39	60
Pantex	10	8	8	80	0	86	86	41	64
Sandia	8	8	8	100	0	63	63	36	66
Savannah River	4	2	2	50	0	100	100	59	85
Y-12	9	9	9	100	0	100	100	41	72
<b>NNSA Totals</b>	68	60	58	<b>85</b>	0	86	<b>69</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>DOE GOALS</b>	-	-	-	<b>100</b>	-	-	<b>&gt;80</b>	<b>&gt;40</b>	<b>&gt;60</b>

\* % Field Time is defined as the number of hours spent in the plant/field divided by the total available work hours in the quarter. The total available work hours is the actual number of hours a Facility Representative works in a calendar quarter, including overtime hours. It does not include leave time (sick, annual, or other) or holidays.

\*\* % Oversight Time includes % Field Time

### NNSA Facility Representative (FR) Highlights:

- At Livermore, FRs supported a review by the Office of Independent Oversight and Performance Assurance (OA) in nuclear and non-nuclear operations. FRs from almost all facilities were included in the detailed reviews of LLNL operations and NNSA oversight of the operations. There were substantial deficiencies identified in implementing work control processes, design of safety systems, configuration management, and quality assurance implementation.
- At Los Alamos, FRs participated as Lead Observers in the process to resume operations following the operations shutdown. Also, an FR participated as a team member on the LASO self-assessment of Environmental Safety and Health Oversight.
- At Nevada, NSO FRs identified multiple findings relating to contractor excavation work at the NTS, which resulted in a work shut down. The FR's follow-up activity helped bring about improvements to the work process and a safer work environment. Also, NSO FRs participated in the LANL Resumption review to restart all risk level 3 facilities at the NTS operated by LANL.
- At Y-12, an FR fully qualified at all assigned facilities within 6 months of arrival. Also, an FR was instrumental in achieving improved ventilation in a facility that has hazardous material and adding a new personnel change house. Over the years, the ventilation system for this facility had evolved to a positive atmosphere to the environment. The facility now has a negative atmosphere to the environment. These changes combined with improvements in Conduct of Operations with in the facility create a better, safer, and cleaner environment for the workers.
- At Savannah River, FRs conducted an assessment on the WSRC Sample Assay System (SAS) Readiness Assessment. SAS training, procedure reviews, resolution of findings and observed evolutions were included in the assessment. The SAS will provide continued component testing capability after the closure of 232-H.

## OFFICE OF SCIENCE SITES

### Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators (4QCY2004)

<u>Area/Site Office</u>	<u>Staffing Analysis</u>	<u>FTE Level</u>	<u>Actual Staffing</u>	<u>% Staffing</u>	<u>Attrition</u>	<u>% Core Qualified</u>	<u>% Fully Qualified</u>	<u>% Field Time *</u>	<u>% Oversight Time **</u>
Ames	1	1	1	100	0	100	100	20	80
Argonne	5	5	5	100	0	100	100	23	78
Brookhaven	6	6	6	100	0	100	100	36	94
Fermi	2	2	2	100	0	100	50	28	72
Oak Ridge (SC)	2	2	1	50	0	50	50	50	60
Pacific Northwest	2	2	2	100	0	100	100	42	74
Princeton	1	1	1	100	0	100	100	48	68
<b>SC Site Totals</b>	19	19	18	<b>95</b>	0	97	<b>92</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>DOE GOALS</b>	-	-	-	<b>100</b>	-	-	<b>&gt;80</b>	<b>&gt;40</b>	<b>&gt;60</b>

\* % Field Time is defined as the number of hours spent in the plant/field divided by the total available work hours in the quarter. The total available work hours is the actual number of hours a Facility Representative works in a calendar quarter, including overtime hours. It does not include leave time (sick, annual, or other) or holidays.

\*\* % Oversight Time includes % Field Time

### SC Facility Representative (FR) Highlights:

- At Brookhaven, several FRs conducted a surveillance on an incinerator demolition project as a result of an initial work interruption by a FR. A review of the work planning process for the project determined vulnerabilities in industrial hygiene and work planning/control. The proposed corrective actions and outstanding issues are currently being evaluated by BHSO.
- At Fermi, FRs supported the technical review of the NuMI safety assessment document (SAD) and the activities associated with the NuMI readiness review. Also, FRs participated in the revision of the DOE Accelerator Safety Guide.
- At Pacific Northwest, FRs were involved in the tracking and updating of emerging issues in construction safety, work control, and electrical safety at PNNL and reported them to the Site Office Manager and SC-HQ. Also, an FR monitored the contractor's evaluation of their stack air samplers' heat trace wires conducted in response to a contractor employee who received minor flash burns.

## OFFICE OF NUCLEAR ENERGY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY SITES

### Facility Representative Program Performance Indicators (4QCY2004)

<u>Area/Ops Office</u>	<u>Staffing Analysis</u>	<u>FTE Level</u>	<u>Actual Staffing</u>	<u>% Staffing</u>	<u>Attrition</u>	<u>% Core Qualified</u>	<u>% Fully Qualified</u>	<u>% Field Time *</u>	<u>% Oversight Time **</u>
Idaho (MFC)	3	3	3	100	0	100	100	32	60
Idaho (NE)	9	6	6	67	0	100	100	39	63
Oak Ridge (NE)	5	5	6	120	0	67	50	40	52
<b>NE Totals</b>	17	14	15	<b>88</b>	0	87	<b>80</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>DOE GOALS</b>	-	-	-	<b>100</b>	-	-	<b>&gt;80</b>	<b>&gt;40</b>	<b>&gt;60</b>

\* % Field Time is defined as the number of hours spent in the plant/field divided by the total available work hours in the quarter. The total available work hours is the actual number of hours a Facility Representative works in a calendar quarter, including overtime hours. It does not include leave time (sick, annual, or other) or holidays.

\*\* % Oversight Time includes % Field Time

### NE Facility Representative (FR) Highlights:

- At Idaho (MFC), the Materials and Fuels Complex FRs are being reported along with NE-ID FRs. Also, following an event involving an uptake of plutonium (Pu) at the MFC Fuel Manufacturing Facility (FMF), a FR identified that no procedure was written for performance of the evolution being performed. The FR did not agree with the occurrence reporting category designation due to the impact on safe facility operations and worker health and safety. This prompted additional contractor review and a causal analysis that resulted in a contractor imposed stand-down of further Pu handling at MFC until appropriate corrective actions could be identified and implemented.
- At Idaho (NE), FRs at the Reactor Technology Complex (RTC) closely followed the Advanced Test Reactor (ATR) Core Internals Changeout (CIC), a major overhaul of reactor core components and supporting plant equipment that is performed every 7 -10 years. The CIC began in August 2004 and is scheduled to complete in February 2005. RTC FRs worked many backshifts, weekends and holidays observing work in progress and reviewing work control documents to ensure worker safety and proper facility operations.